

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 1, 2009, claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) for alleged anticipation by, or in the alternative, under 35 USC §103(a) for alleged obviousness over EP 1488775 to Shimizu.

In view of the clarifications presented herein, it is respectfully submitted that all claims 1, 3-10, and 14 are in condition for allowance.

The EP '775 publication describes a liquid cleansing preparation comprising a nonionic surfactant referred to as ingredient (B) that exhibits an IOB value of at least 1.1. See claim 1 of EP 1488775 for example.

In contrast, it is explained in the present application that "the desirable IOB of the oil component has a trend to increase with an increase of the HLB of the nonionic surfactant. In the region where the HLB of the nonionic surfactant is 8-10, it is desirable that the IOB of the oil component is 0.02 to 0.07." See [0057] of the present application.

With respect to the foregoing, a nonionic surfactant exhibiting an HLB value of 8-10, as in the present invention is significantly different from a nonionic surfactant exhibiting an IOB value of at least 1.1, as described in the EP '775 publication.

As evident in the following approximate relationship, HLB values are approximately 10 times that of corresponding IOB values for the same compound:

$$\text{HLB value} = \text{IOB value} * 10$$

Therefore, applying this relationship to the description in the EP '775 publication that the nonionic surfactant exhibit an IOB value of at least 1.1, results in

an approximate HLB value for the nonionic surfactant in the EP '775 publication of at least 11 (10 times 1.1).

In contrast, all pending claims now recite that the nonionic surfactant has a HLB of 8 to 10. This specific claim language expressly excludes the EP '775 publication which describes its nonionic surfactant as having an HLB value of at least 11.

In addition, all pending claims recite that the oil component has an IOB of 0.02 to 0.07. The EP '775 publication entirely fails to disclose or even suggest this particular range.

Furthermore, as recited in the claims, the weight ratio of component (A), the nonionic surfactant, and component (B), the oil component is 1:4 to 2:1. The EP '775 publication entirely fails to disclose or even suggest this particular range of weight ratios.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 1, 3-10, and 14 are now in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. IWI-16714.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL & CLARK LLP

By /Mark E. Bandy/
Mark E. Bandy, Reg. No. 35788

38210 Glenn Avenue
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7808
(216) 566-9700